WORK SESSION TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 2016 COUNCIL CHAMBERS 211 WEST ASPEN AVENUE 6:00 P.M.

NONE

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

Mayor Nabours called the Work Session of June 14, 2016, to order at 6:00 p.m.

NOTICE OF OPTION TO RECESS INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION

Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the City Council and to the general public that, at this work session, the City Council may vote to go into executive session, which will not be open to the public, for legal advice and discussion with the City's attorneys for legal advice on any item listed on the following agenda, pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3).

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The audience and City Council recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Roll Call

NOTE: One or more Councilmembers may be in attendance telephonically or by other technological means.

PRESENT: ABSENT:

MAYOR NABOURS
VICE MAYOR BAROTZ
COUNCILMEMBER BREWSTER
COUNCILMEMBER EVANS
COUNCILMEMBER ORAVITS
COUNCILMEMBER OVERTON
COUNCILMEMBER PUTZOVA

Others present: City Manager Josh Copley and City Attorney Sterling Solomon.

4. Preliminary Review of Draft Agenda for the June 21, 2016, City Council Meeting.*

* Public comment on draft agenda items may be taken under "Review of Draft Agenda Items" later in the meeting, at the discretion of the Mayor. Citizens wishing to speak on agenda items not specifically called out by the City Council for discussion under the second Review section may submit a speaker card for their items of interest to the recording clerk.

Mayor Nabours said that there were a number of citizens present regarding the Public Works Yard. He said that if they run long on that they will continue the discussion to next week.

5. Public Participation

Public Participation enables the public to address the council about items that are not on the prepared agenda. Public Participation appears on the agenda twice, at the beginning and at the end of the work session. You may speak at one or the other, but not both. Anyone wishing to comment at the meeting is asked to fill out a speaker card and submit it to the recording clerk. When the item comes up on the agenda, your name will be called. You may address the Council up to three times throughout the meeting, including comments made during Public Participation. Please limit your remarks to three minutes per item to allow everyone to have an opportunity to speak. At the discretion of the Chair, ten or more persons present at the meeting and wishing to speak may appoint a representative who may have no more than fifteen minutes to speak.

The following individuals addressed Council regarding the following issues:

- •Duffie Westheimer, Flagstaff, regarding the Flagstaff Townsite Historic Properties Land Trust
- •Charlie Silver, Flagstaff, offered in addition to NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard) they consider KOBY (Know Our Back Yard)

6. Flagstaff Regional Plan 2015 Annual Report

Comprehensive Planning Manager Sara Dechter introduced Jennifer Mikelson, Associate Planner, who then presented a PowerPoint presentation that addressed:

FLAGSTAFF REGIONAL PLAN 2030

ANNUAL REPORT OBJECTIVES

- 1) Measure progress of Plan implementation through metrics
- 2) Report on all activities that directly implement the Plan
- 3) Identify future Plan amendments and projects

www.flagstaffmatters.com

SECOND YEAR CHALLENGES

Evolving format
Consistent data collection
Revisions to baseline data
Refined language
New metrics

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Open Space
Public Facilities
Water Resources
Energy

BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Community Character Growth Areas and Land Use Transportation Cost of Development

Vice Mayor Barotz said that one thing not on the chart of the Built Environment that she

receives a lot of questions about is congestion and how long it takes to move along Milton. She suggested that they figure out how to incorporate that issue so that over time they can see if they are doing better or it is getting worse.

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

Indicators of overall community well being Neighborhoods, housing and urban conservation Economic development

MISSING METRICS

Most missing metrics are from Natural Environment section
Some metrics are now available annually
Future metrics to be developed
Connectivity of roadways
Affordability index
Median wage of new companies

MOST CITED GOALS IN STAFF MEMOS TO COUNCIL

- 1) Goal PF.2
- 2) Goal LU.7
- 3) Goal T.1
- 4) Goal ED.3
- 5) Goal E&C.6

She added that 67 out of 75 goals were noted at least once by staff in staff summaries

REGIONAL PLAN ACCOMPLISHMENTS Interactive Map

Ms. Dechter then introduced Nate Renn with the IT Department who gave a presentation of the interactive map they are working on.

Ms. Mikelson then continued the presentation.

FUTURE COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING PROJECTS Ongoing Plan Amendments - Chapter 3 Minor Plan Amendment

PROPOSED PLAN AMENDMENTS

UPCOMING SPECIFIC PLANS

High Occupancy Ped/Bi Master Plan Southside Neighborhood Plan

Mayor Nabours asked Council if anyone else had any comments or suggestions on the format for the report. He suggested that it would be nice to compare the three years. Councilmember Putzova said that the idea of charts for the future would be great. She said that a lot of these metrics they probably have historic data for and it would be interesting to see how the community performs.

Ms. Dechter thanked all of those on staff that contributed to the report.

7. History and Overview of Mogollon Public Works Facility, History of Project Scope and Funding of Core Services Maintenance Facility, and future of Mogollon Public Works Facility and Funding of Project

Public Works Director Andy Bertelsen began a PowerPoint presentation which addressed:

DISCUSSION

Background on Core Services Facility

- 1) History of Project Scope
- 2) Current Project Scope and Funding

Background on Mogollon Property as Public Works Facility

Council

HISTORY OF PROJECT SCOPE CURRENT PROJECT SCOPE AND COST ESTIMATES

Real Estate Manager Charity Lee then continued the presentation:

BACKGROUND ON MOGOLLON PROPERTY

Ms. Lee presented different maps showing the history of the property.

MOGOLLON PROPERTY

FINANCIAL OPTIONS FOR CORE SERVICES FACILITY

- 1) Amend portion of Ordinance and sell 7 acres
- 2) Retain property
- 3) Defer decision and direct staff to pursue additional information

Vice Mayor Barotz said that she was interested to know about the land and water conservation grant funds made to the City for enhancing recreation opportunities. It was her understanding that when the community accepts federal money they cannot repurpose the property to be sold off. She asked that staff investigate that further.

Mr. Copley said that he could see this continuing until next week to allow staff time to obtain additional information and prepare more maps.

Councilmember Overton said that before they took public comment, he wanted to emphasize that he was committed to the Core Maintenance Facility being relocated and built, whether or not this becomes their funding gap. At the end of the day, they may decide that it is not, but for him and the community their goal has been to move the yard out of downtown. He does not want to delay the design process and contracting process because they have a shortfall.

Councilmember Oravits asked staff what the timeline was. Mr. Bertelsen said that the original timeline was to have it completed by June 2017, but it has been pushed and they are now going for Winter of 2017/2018.

Councilmember Putzova asked what other options would be available for funding if Council should decide to not sell this property.

A break was taken from 7:24 p.m. to 7:36 p.m.

The following individuals spoke in favor of maintaining the property as part of Thorpe Park:

- Jim David
- Jerry Johnson

- •Bill Ring
- Charlie Silver
- Rick Moore
- Rose Houk
- Kathy Flaccus
- Duffie Westheimer
- Katie Hampton
- Haydee Hampton
- Lance Diskan
- Constance Taylor
- Tory Syracuse, Friends of Flagstaff's Future
- Don Perry
- Andrea Perry
- •Glenn Rink
- •Roabie Johnson
- Britt DeMuth
- Jim McCarthy
- Jazlee Crowley
- Alan Motter
- Jerry Thull
- George Bain

Comments received included:

- •Property was trusted as a city park; over the years all kinds of things happened
- •34 acres have turned into homes
- •Wrote grants in 1973 and 1974 to clean up the pond
- •Property is a riparian area
- •Council in 1957 probably saw the cannibalization of the park and adopted Ordinance to maintain as park
- •Is not a matter of NIMBY; the proximity to schools, the Rio, ballfields and the pond begs the question of what other public use could be made of the yard
- •Urge you not to repeal Ordinance 425
- •Flagstaff already faces a backlog for acquisition for parks
- •Tournaments at the park bring in millions
- •Two members on Parks and Recreation Commission recommend yard remain a park
- •Remind Council they are obligated to serve
- •Maintain the rock building; keep it for historic use
- Many questions remain unanswered
- •At the May 18 meeting at Joe C. Montoya Center staff presented legal authority; they need moral arguments
- •Need to listen to what the people want
- •Flagstaff Soccer Club has about 600 kids participating in the program, both recreational and competitive; they don't have enough fields
- •Choices of the Council will show the integrity of the Council

Mayor Nabours said that they have a few questions for staff and this will continue on to next week. He invited everyone to return to the continuation of the discussion.

Vice Mayor Barotz said that it is unfortunate that they did not have this information before the 2012 election when the Core Maintenance Facility was on the ballot. She feels badly that the process has been backward.

Councilmember Evans said that the discussion tonight is a policy discussion. She has a whole list of 20 questions that she could ask staff to look into, but she really has all of the information

she needs.

She said that in 2012 they were looking to find a way to fund a new yard. The idea of selling the property was a good idea at that time; now they have more information. They do need to fund a new public works yard; it is their responsibility to make sure they have the appropriate facilities to meet the citizen needs.

The following individuals submitted written comment cards in support of maintaining the public works yard as part of Thorpe Park:

- .•Amy Perry
- .•Janice K. Busco
- .•Monica G. Lane
- .•Holu Owens
- .•Walter Taylor
- .•Janice K. Trumpp
- .•Trudy Hope
- .•Margaret E. Allen
- .•Constance Taylor
- .•Karen Enyedy
- .•Susan J. Hueftle
- .•Dawn Tucker
- .•Caleb Ring
- .•Jane Rukema
- .•Ardis Easton
- .•George W. Bain
- .•Brad Johnson
- .•Tara Walstad
- .•John Schulman

Steven Richard submitted a written comment card requesting the space be used for low-income housing.

A break was held from 8:55 p.m. to 9:02 p.m.

8. Transit Tax Renewal

Assistant to the City Manager Stephanie Smith began a PowerPoint presentation which reviewed:

OUTLINE

Council Timeline
Renewal of the City Transit Tax
Continued dedicated sales tax
Courthouse Bond Project
Secondary property tax
Ballot Timeline

COUNCIL TIMELINE

06/14 - Council direction on transit tax and courthouse project; draft ballot questions

06/28 - Review proposed ballot language

07/05 - Call election and final action on ballot language

Jeff Meilbeck with NAIPTA then continued the presentation.

KEY POINTS

TRANSIT DECISION 2016

NAIPTA operates transit for City

Transit funded by \$.00295 transit tax

Transit tax sunsets 06/30/2020 if not renewed

NAIPTA Board requests 2016 ballot question

City Council holds authority on how, when or if to send ballot question to voters

PROGRESS TO DATE

Council Presentation 04/12/16

Options of Timing and Amount

Advantages and Disadvantages

Citizen Review Committee - 04/21/16

Public Survey April 2016

Sytematic Random Sample

Fred Solop

Team Transit

City, NAU, County, NAIPTA met twice on public education/outreach

PUBLIC OUTREACH SCHEDULE

Publicity Pamphlet Final (August)

Cityscape (Fall)

4 Open Houses (September and October)

20 Civic Group Presentations (Fall)

Bus Stops Here Events (Fall)

Update Council (October)

NAIPTA LIKELY VOTER SURVEY

Impression of Mountain Line

Positive 86%

Negative 2%

Neutral 3%

Don't Know 9%

Support for Extending Current Tax

10 years vs. 20 years

71% strongly support for 10 years

16% somewhat support

Ballot language suggests 10 years

Mayor Nabours asked if it would be the end of the bus system if the tax is not renewed. Mr.Meilbeck said that it would as the revenues raised are used to leverage other grants and put service in place. It would fall apart without that funding; it pays operating costs.

Mayor Nabours asked what the rationale was with bringing this forward now when it does not end until 2020. Mr. Meilbeck said that if they waited until 2020 there would be a four month gap from June 30 to November (election time) and if they took it in 2018, there are likely to be other initiatives related to transportation that are new that are going to have to be carefully messaged.

Ms. Smith said that tonight they are looking for direction on whether to move forward with preparing the ballot question. She said that they have draft language on page 84 of the packet, but given the timeline they would like to receive input tonight and approve the final language on July 5.

Vice Mayor Barotz said that she strongly supports moving this forward. She has been on the NAIPTA Board for six years and she believes it is an incredibly-run operation.

Councilmember Overton said that he was the newer member on the NAIPTA Board and what is fantastic for the community is the ability to leverage so much from a small sales tax. He added that it was a wise time to go to the voters.

Councilmember Putzova said that she would like to hear a little more discussion that the Board had on ten years versus twenty years.

Mr. Meilbeck said that he supports it being 10 years because it keeps transportation accountable to the community. Ten years is enough time to get things done.

Councilmember Brewster said that she agreed with that. She has been on the Board two different times and it is well run and has grown a lot since initiated.

Mayor Nabours said that consensus of Council was to move this forward and bring back ballot language.

Ms. Smith then reviewed the timeline:

07/10, 07/17 and 07/24 - Call for pro/con statements for pamphlet

08/10 - Deadline to receive pro/con statements

08/11 - Final Publicity Pamphlet

Early October - Publicity Pamphlets need to be mailed to residents

11/08 - Election

Mayor Nabours said that they would now go back to Item 7.

9. Discussion of New Municipal Courts Facility and draft ballot language

City Manager Josh Copley reviewed a PowerPoint presentation which addressed:

NEW MUNICIPAL COURTHOUSE

Co-located facility with Coconino County Justice Court

Proposed location to be site of old downtown jail

A downtown parking structure is included in the project costs

Vice Mayor Barotz suggested that in the future when they describe the property, it should be more specific, with street names, for newcomers to identify.

PROJECT FUNDING:

City share of project cost is approximately \$21,500,000

They have identified \$11,500,000 in potentially available funding

CURRENT PROJECT FUNDING

Court Fees \$2M (accumulated in fees fund)

Real Estate Fund \$520K Redevelop Fund \$500K Capital Improvement \$400K

Capital Financing \$4M (leverage of future court fees) financing – apply future court fees

PROPOSED ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Sale of existing courthouse \$2M Sale of Cherry Building \$2M **Ballot** initiative

\$10-12M

Mr. Copley said that the rate of property tax and capacity would not be affected by either a \$10 million or \$12 million bond. On a \$10 million bond the debt would be retired sooner.

Mr. Goodrich said that they would look at it as the project progresses to determine whether they would issue bonds all at one time, or over two different times.

PROPOSED ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Mayor Nabours said that his only concern is with the tolerance of the voters. Mr. Copley said that they conducted an open house and received 32 comments from those attending. The difference between \$10 million and \$12 million did not seem to be overly significant to them. He added that the County is planning to fund their portion through capital financing so they would not be submitting any question to the voters.

Vice Mayor Evans said that they should go out for the \$12 million and not tie the sale of the APS building to it. Mr. Copley said that there has not been much attention given to the fact that they were proposing to sell the existing courthouse property. What is before them with a \$12 million bond does include the sale of the current courthouse property, but not the APS building. He said that the current court facility and Cherry buildings are aging and will require significant investment in order to maintain them.

Mayor Nabours asked if there was a way to ask on the ballot about the sale of the property. Mr. Copley said that there are legal concerns in doing so. He noted that the City currently has a development agreement with Marriot that states that they would work with the City on a parking structure on their property across the street, as well as the portion of the City property that is currently located at the existing lot. They would propose that the rest of the other property going south be sold, but how a parking structure might be developed into that is yet to be determined.

Councilmember Putzova said that she would support a \$12 million bond, but not tie any property to it. Mr. Copley said that without identifying the \$2 million needed for the project there will be questions to be answered because people will do the math; they can certainly say they envision the sale of City property.

Vice Mayor Barotz said that she was reluctant to tie the issue to the property; they should not commit themselves to something that would be irreversible. She said that she would support a \$12 million bond.

Councilmember Overton said that he was okay with selling the courthouse property, but he does not want to put the City into a position where they go to the voters with a clear intention of selling, and then decide they would rather go a different route. He would support a \$12 million bond and would be comfortable with sale of the courthouse property.

Mr. Copley said that they would be hoping for a proposal from a developer to do a parking garage with some type of redevelopment, in collaboration with Marriot. They do know that a parking structure just on the Marriot property is not a feasible option; it will be dependent on the type of proposals received.

Consensus of Council was to move forward with a \$12 million bond and removing the current Cherry Building property from the equation.

Mayor Nabours asked staff if they had any sense of tolerance in the amount of the bond. Mr.Jacobs0n said that he wished he did. When they went out last time it was the perfect storm of issues that came up. They lacked specifics with location, design, lack of support, etc. and there were several other tax issues at that time. It was also significantly larger; they now are asking for \$12 million and have a specific location. It is his hope and belief that the community will support it. They need to help the community understand the real need.

10.	Review of Draf	t Agenda Items t	for the June 21, 2	2016, City	y Council Meeting.*
-----	----------------	------------------	--------------------	------------	---------------------

* Public comment on draft agenda items will be taken at this time, at the discretion of the Mayor.

None

11. Public Participation

None

12. Informational Items To/From Mayor, Council, and City Manager; and future agenda item requests.

Mr. Copley reminded everyone that on Friday morning from 7:30 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. the City would be hosting the Alliance for Second Century meeting with their partners. One of the topics will be a presentation by JT Tannous and the possibility of investigating a cultural facility for Flagstaff.

13. Adjournment

The Work Session of the Flagstaff City Council held June 14, 2016, adjourned at 9:32 p.m.

	MAYOR	
ATTEST:		
CITY CLERK		